

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application and for the personal interview conducted on May 6, 2003, with applicant's representative. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and this response has been generated accordingly.

Claims 1 3-4, and 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (U.S. 5,796,848—hereinafter '848) in view of Martin *et al.* (U.S. 6,069,963—hereinafter '963). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a microphone encapsulated in an "electromagnetic shielding case (3)" (line 3), and an "analog/digital converter (5)" which is "mounted on an *outside* of the electromagnetic shielding case (3)" (lines 4-5, emphasis added). '848 clearly has its A/D converter 7 mounted *within* the shielded case 9. The Office action admits as much. The Examiner thus cites '963 for teaching microphones and an ADC, where microphones can be optionally shielded alone or *without* an ADC. Even if true, this would not teach an ADC mounted on an outside of the shielding case, as claimed. Further, an examination of '963 does not show any suggestion of mounting an ADC on an outside of a shielding case. The Examiner agreed at the personal interview that '963 did not appear to teach mounting on an outside of the shielding case.

In order to satisfy a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest *all* of the claim elements and/or claim limitations (MPEP §2143.03). Accordingly, because the *combination* of references does not teach all of the elements of claim 1, then claim 1 is patentable over the references.

Claim 3, which depends on claim 1, is thus patentable over the references for the same reason, as well as for the limitations contained therein. Claims 2, and 4-7, being directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are patentable over the references for the same reasons, as well as for the limitations contained therein.

New claim 8 also recites an "analog/digital converter mounted on an outside of said electromagnetic shielding case" and thus claim 8 is patentable for the same reasons as claim 1. Further, claim 8 requires that the A/D converter be "electromagnetically shielded from

said microphone", which is not suggested by any of the references, and thus claim 8 is patentable over the references for the that reason as well.

Claims 2-3 & 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin (U.S. 5,796,848—hereinafter '848) in view of Martin *et al.* (U.S. 6,069,963—hereinafter '963) and further in view of Husung (U.S. Pat. No. 5,809,151). Because Husung does not overcome the shortcomings of '848 and '963, these claims are patentable over this combination for the reasons discussed for claim 1, above.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32396.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

June 12, 2003